



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

water supply sufficient for all the requirements of the present population will be successfully completed.

*Holder:* The decrease in membership necessitates the requirement of fewer blocks and consequently a much more economical system of channeling. The area under cereals here should, provided the season continues favorable, yield sufficient to meet the annual expenditure; but the strictest economy will be required in all branches for the next two years to pull the place through.

*Waikerie:* I still hold the opinion that Waikerie has greater possibilities before it than any of the other settlements; but a firm and practical management, with the most rigid economy, will be required for the next two years to place the estate on a thoroughly sound basis.

*Ramco:* The whole of the settlers are now residing upon their respective blocks as surveyed, and the place presents a much more permanent and attractive appearance than any of the other settlements at present. With judicious and economic management no further financial aid should be necessary at Ramco.

Mr. McIntosh closes his report with these words:

Great interest is manifested in the proposed future legislation on behalf of the associations, and no doubt exists but that the actual knowledge of an alteration in the present act will materially benefit the general community by causing them to be more economical, independent and self-reliant.

Mr. Gillen's experiment, begun without sufficient preparation and forethought, may still end happily, even in a somewhat limited form. Indeed, M. Vigouroux thinks, and probably with justice, that the experiment would have been finally shipwrecked long ago if the Chafey estate had not done pioneer work which facilitated matters proportionally for the unskilled and starving men from the great town. Without the markets and shipping provided by the Canadian firm, without the experience gained by their 600 blockers, it would probably have fared very badly with the Adelaide workmen on the Murray.

LEOPOLD KATSCHER.

BUDAPEST.

---

### THE SITUATION IN FINLAND.<sup>1</sup>

THIS book, which has appeared simultaneously in Danish, French, and English, is especially welcome at this time when thousands of Finnish immigrants, driven by the troubled political condition of their country and by economic distress, are seeking a new home in the

<sup>1</sup>N. C. FREDERIKSEN, *Finland, Its Public and Private Economy*. London: Edward Arnold, 1902.

United States. The book is more comprehensive than its title would indicate, as can be seen from the topics treated in its eleven chapters, viz.: (1) "Peculiarities of Finnish Civilization" (history of the early settlement of the country); (2) "The Agricultural Classes;" (3) "The Land Laws of Finland;" (4) "Methods and Conditions of Agriculture;" (5) "Forestry;" (6) "Mining and Manufacturing Industries;" (7) "Commerce, Navigation, and Fisheries;" (8) "Money and Banking;" (9) "Means of Communication;" (10) "The Exchequer;" (11) "The Government of Finland and its Future."

The chapters devoted to agriculture and the Finnish peasantry are full of interest to the student of comparative history of economic institutions. The methods of agriculture and forms of land tenure bear remarkable resemblance to those observed among the Russian peasantry in the adjoining regions of the empire.

By derivation all peasant land tenure in Finland can be traced to two original forms: the village community, with joint ownership, and the isolated farm, *torp*, of which the linguistic equivalents are the English "thorpe," the German *Dorf*, and, may we suggest, the Russian *derevnya*. The latter, like its German equivalent, generally denotes a village; but in the extreme north of European Russia the word *derevnya* was in former centuries applied to precisely such an isolated farm as the Finnish *torp*, occupied by one large family, a sort of a co-operative household; like the *torp*, the *derevnya* was also a unit of taxation. Each of these forms of tenure in Finland, as in Russia, was the outgrowth of geographical and agricultural conditions. The land in this region is cut up by innumerable lakes and rivers into small plots overgrown with forest, largely swampy, and unfit for cultivation. In some parts of Finland nearly one-fifth of the surface is water; enormous bogs cover another fifth, and in some parts as much as one-half. Man must here create farm land for himself, which he does by burning the forest. As late as ten years ago, says Professor Frederiksen,

Ten or twelve peasants in the eastern parishes not far from the Prussian frontier would arrange for the burning of the forests and the cultivation of the land for some years afterwards. This was done sometimes by a family, sometimes by a party of peasants forming a small informal company. The members of the company shared the profits according to the "axes" or numbers of persons whom they sent or brought. They went 80 or 100 miles into the woods with sledges loaded with everything necessary to pass the summer there. They lived in huts, felled the trees, and came again after the lapse of two summers to burn the trees and undergrowth, and sow and reap crops (generally rye) over an area of 20 to 40 acres. When they had decided

which area they intended to burn, it was marked out on the trees, and these marks were respected by all newcomers. (P. 40.)

This is the origin of the village community both in Finland and in Russia; its foundation lay in the economic necessity of co-operation. Joint ownership was the result of joint labor invested in the clearing of the forest. Scarcity of land made these plots very valuable; the differences in the quality of the soil necessitated a system of equalization, which consisted in the land being cut up into a number of tracts of varying size, according to quality, and each joint owner was allotted a proportionate share in each tract. This system of intermitted acres, which later became a hindrance to agricultural improvement, entailed no inconvenience at that early period, when such clearings were cultivated only a limited number of years in succession and then used as grazing lands.

The patches of arable land amidst miles of swampy forest are often much too small to permit of the settlement of a village. In such cases it would be occupied by one household, the *torp* or *derevnya*. But the old-time Finnish household, like the old-time Russian household, was not confined to father, mother, and their unmarried children; the children would usually continue to live under the parental roof and under parental authority, even after marriage. The death of the head of this patriarchal household did not necessarily result in its dissolution. A new head of the household would be elected, a "host" (in Russia *bolshák*, "senior"), who was responsible for all taxes to the fisc. We learn from the author that this custom has survived even among the tenants of the crown lands, notwithstanding the present law which favors inheritance in one person only and discourages division of the farm among all the heirs.

The dissolution of the village community began in Finland a century earlier than in Russia. The first legislative act relating to it dates back to 1750. The process was very slow, however, and a century later, in 1848, there were still in many places enormous tracts of forest held in common by several villages and parishes. This is again a counterpart of the old "township community" of northern Russia (*obshtchina-volost*). The dissolution of the village community went on apace with the introduction of new systems of rotation of crops. The government very early tried to discourage the burning of forests for farming purposes, but its efforts remained unavailing, until the development of the lumber industry made this practice unprofitable. It was abandoned for the two-field and the three-field system. The

latter is still as prevalent among the Finnish peasantry as in Russia. While in Russia, however, the division of the communal lands has been retarded by the policy of the government, under the influence first of the Slavophiles, and later of the "populists" (*narodniki*), the government of Finland, on the contrary, encouraged it, and as a result a number of farmhouses have been moved out from the villages and the process of inclosure has been practically completed.

Land ownerships among the peasantry of Finland was materially affected by its political relations to Russia.

In the southeastern corner of the country, ceded to Russia partly in 1721 and partly in 1743, Peter the Great and the empress Elizabeth made large donations of lands, as they were accustomed to do in other parts of their empire. Men with well-known Russian names obtained hundreds of farms here, sometimes even a number of villages with thousands of inhabitants. These were granted at first for indefinite periods or for life, but later on were given as property to be inherited and freely disposed of. Most of the peasants were hereditary tenants, some of them even proprietors. It was decreed that the nobles to whom these lands were granted should receive two-thirds of the revenue due to the crown, the crown retaining one-third; and in 1728 it was decided that the peasants should pay only the same amounts which they had paid when the country belonged to Sweden.

In time, however, the peasants began to suffer from acts of tyranny on the part of these new landlords, who, as was their custom in Russia, seized farms, and turned them into home-farms with manor-houses for their own use. Their Russian estate agents demanded that the peasants, with their horses, should work for the landlord instead of paying their dues in grain. The local government officials, many of whom had come from the Swedish part of Finland, were usually willing to recognize the rights of the peasants, but the Russian nobles were not used to tolerating such interference with what they regarded as their private business, and refused to recognize the jurisdiction of these government officials and their courts. Worst of all was the treatment meted out to the peasants at the imperial small-arms factory in Systerbäck, which demanded so much work that the four parishes from which it drew its labor had to be replaced after a time by another four. The local agent of the Alexander Nevski Convent in St. Petersburg even refused to give the peasants receipts for work and other dues paid to him, and this proceeding was quite a common one. Accustomed as such overseers were in Russia to demand work at their pleasure, they could not understand why they should not claim the same rights in Finland, and increase rents, and make what demands they pleased from the peasants. In a famous lawsuit between Baron Fredericksz of Taubila and his peasants, in the reign of the empress Catherine, a decision was given by the Imperial Senate by which the landlord might increase the rent of his peasants notwithstanding the decision of

1728. The empress Catherine, in whose reign, notwithstanding her liberal professions, serfdom developed into such complete slavery that the serfs could be sold off the estates, gave donations in Old Finland of "souls with farms and habitations as eternal and hereditary possessions." . . . In the time of Alexander I. demands came from the Russian nobles in Finland that the government should introduce into Finland a complete system of Russian serfdom. In a lawsuit between Count Orloff and his peasants, it was decided by the Imperial Senate that rent could be fixed by the landlord at his will, and that peasants who tried to leave their estates should be regarded as offenders against the emperor and as criminals. The landlord would not even permit women to marry outside their estates without permission. . . . The nobles did not gain their point about the introduction of serfdom, but they obtained an official declaration that they were absolute proprietors of the peasant farms. . . . Those peasants who could furnish valid proofs that their farms were proprietary peasant farms preserved their rights. Three senators, who were members of the committee, further recommended that the present tenants should be allowed to keep their original rights for their lifetime. Nicholas I., who had now ascended the throne, decided, however, that the estates were to be the absolute property of the landlord, even when originally they had only been granted for a term of years; but that, on the other hand, the peasants should retain their old rights for ten years, that is, till 1837. The peasants continued a restive opposition, refusing to sign contracts, and working badly when called upon to work for their masters. Their labor, as a means of paying dues, had lost two-thirds or three-quarters of its ordinary value. Hundreds of farms were deserted, so that the tyranny of the nobles did not even benefit themselves. . . . In the more liberal days of Alexander II., when the Finnish estates were once more convened in diet, this matter was, of course, one of the prominent questions of the hour. The emperor would not adopt the course recommended by the finance committee as well as by the whole diet, and examine the legality of the decree of 1826, which had given the full rights of ownership in their estates to the Russian nobles. It was thought better to make an attempt to purchase these rights, and then re sell the farms to the peasants. (Pp. 40-45.)

At present the agricultural population of Finland consists of the following classes :

Cultivated Areas.						Number of Farms Owned.	Per Cent.
Less than 5 hectares (12 ½ acres)	-	-	-	-	-	32,000	28
From 5 to 25 hectares	-	-	-	-	-	61,000	51
From 25 to 100 hectares	-	-	-	-	-	22,000	19
More than 100 hectares	-	-	-	-	-	2,700	2
						117,700	100

Some of the farms of the last class are very large; there are farms of 5,000 acres in Lappmark. Some cover an area of 600,000 acres.

But in those semi-arctic regions the size of the holding is no criterion. The preceding figures relate only to peasant farms and do not include the estates of the nobles; nor do they include the class of small tenants, who number 72,000 more and rent, in an average, from 5 to 10 hectares (from  $12\frac{1}{2}$  to 25 acres). Land is rented either on shares or in return for labor, where the landlord cultivates a part of his land. There is, furthermore, a class of farm laborers numbering about 100,000, who own a small patch of land, usually pasturage for a cow.

The estates of the nobility contain at present 900,000 acres of farm land, as against 4,000,000 acres in 1862; the decrease is chiefly the result of the redemption of the lands held by the Russian nobles, which has been referred to above. The Finnish government bought the estates and resold them on small annual payments to the peasants. Moreover, the smaller estates of the native nobility are gradually passing into the hands of the wealthier class which is rising from amidst the peasantry. On the other hand, the largest estates of the nobility, though few in number, are increasing in area. Their chief value is not in agricultural lands, but in their forests which cover an area of 28,000,000 acres, of which 24,000,000 acres are dry forest soil. This is over one-half of the entire area held as private property. Many of these great properties, especially valuable for the lumbering trade, have lately been turned into joint-stock companies.

In some cases the companies cultivate farms on their own account, the Jokkis Joint Stock Company, for instance, which owns some 70,000 acres, half of which is land under cultivation and only a minor part of which is let. Companies of this description have sufficient capital to take advantage of all the newest improvements, but this one has been especially enterprising, as it has built a 20-kilometer railway, and established several thriving industries on its property. It is by these industries and not by farming that the company is making money. (P. 32.)

In an agricultural country the material condition and standard of life of the people are determined primarily by the conditions of land tenure. Accordingly we see in Finland a middle class of well-to-do peasant proprietors.

The dwelling houses give an impression of prosperity. The house has a considerable number of rooms, with fine tiled stoves and good furniture, the walls being covered with books and paintings of popular leaders, of the recent great deputation to St. Petersburg, or sometimes of members of the imperial family who have been regarded as friends to the Finnish people. The peasant proprietor of such a house would have four or five horses, twenty

or thirty cows, good farming implements, possibly of English or American manufacture, and sometimes even a small steam-engine. (P. 20.)

The average value of such a farm is from 15,000 to 20,000 marks (from \$3,000 to \$4,000). There are many farms, however, which can be bought for 4,000 or 5,000 marks. The owners of such farms are not as prosperous as the middle-class proprietors.

Scattered in all parts of the country there are still about 12,000 "smoke cottages," which were formerly quite common in Finland and in old Scandinavia:

It has an open fireplace, and the smoke is let out by openings in the roof, or in the wall just below the roof. There are no windows, and the smoke usually forms a dense cloud in the upper part of the room, the air below being warm and clear. But the wind drives the smoke downward, and eye diseases are frequent where this kind of house exists. (P. 22.)

There is, as appears from this description, far more resemblance between the mode of life of the Finnish and the Russian peasant than the author would concede. The "smoke cottage," as shown by Russian statistics, is still a popular type of a peasant house in agricultural Russia. Even the Finnish *sauna*, or bathhouse, is exactly like the genuine Russian bath:

In this bathhouse is an oven filled with stones, and steam is created by throwing water on these stones. The bathers lie on large berths under the roof, and improve the effect of the bath by whipping themselves with birch twigs. Everyone takes a bath on Saturday night. (P. 23.)

Extreme poverty among peasant proprietors is found in the remote country districts, far away from civilization, where the forests are still untouched and valueless. In bad years they subsist on bread made from bark and chopped straw. Famines were in former times quite frequent and merciless in their devastations. Severe frosts destroyed the crops in 1856, 1862, and 1867; in the year last named the population decreased by 100,000. (Another famine is just now threatening the lives of the Finnish people.)

Among this class of farmers the most primitive farming implements are still in use. The forked plow is a very old implement, consisting of two long forks which move the earth without turning it over. Another very primitive implement is the branch-harrow, formed of a bundle of branches or fir-tops, the stumps of the branches being left on and used as harrow teeth.

Lower still on the social scale we find the farm laborers, most of whom own their houses, with little patches of ground, enabling them



to keep a cow and thus provide milk for the family. Still there is a large percentage among them of *inhysingar* (or "houseless," to use an equivalent term of Russian agricultural statistics). The situation of this class, the author tells us, is "a very unfortunate one." In former times the Finnish poor-law prohibited them from moving out of their own parish, unless they could get someone to give security for them. The peasant farmer with whom they lived could employ them only for a small part of the year, and they passed the long winter sleeping by the fire or elsewhere. Even today people of this class seldom have beds. In those days even their clothes did not always belong to them. In modern times there is more work to do, but there is still a great deal of hardship in the winter.

The bulk of hired farm labor is employed by the middle-class farmers described above. A farm hand in the wealthier districts can now earn from \$120 to \$140 a year, a day laborer 50 cents in the summer and 35 cents in the winter, a woman 26 cents in the summer and 20 cents in the winter, a man with a cart and horse 92 cents in the summer and 64 cents in the winter.

On the whole, the so-called "unattached," *i. e.*, the houseless proletariat, exceeded in 1895 one-third of the population, having nearly doubled since 1877. In some parishes they formed as much as 70 per cent. of the total. Most of them seek employment in the lumber trade.

Along the coast and on the numerous islands off the coast most of the men have from time immemorial been fishermen or sailors. While they are at sea, the land is cultivated by the women. The people consist of the same classes of employing farmers, tenants, and laborers. The advance of the steamboat has brought ruin to many of these people, and has caused a large emigration.

The growth of a rural proletariat has been one of the conditions favoring the development of manufacturing industries in Finland and, parallel with it, a more rapid growth of large cities than of small towns. The wages of factory workers are as a rule higher than those of farm laborers, though very low as compared with American standards. In the paper-mills the average wages amount to \$120 a year; in saw-mills to \$170, to which must be added the value of house rent and fire-wood furnished free by the employer. In the earthenware and china works the wages range from \$132 to \$288 a year. At glass factories they average \$190. The highest wages are paid to iron workers, about \$180 a year, and to engineers, \$216 a year.

Of course, when wages are reduced from marks to dollars, it must

be remembered that the purchasing power of money is far higher in countries with low wages than in the United States.

The development of the Finnish manufacturing industry materially suffers from the recent policy of the Russian government, and this in part accounts for the universal disaffection of all classes of the Finnish people to the imperial government.

Under the constitution of Finland, granted by Alexander I. and sworn to by all his successors, the relations between the Russian empire and the great duchy of Finland were analogous to the union between Austria and Hungary under the present organization of the Habsburg monarchy. The government of Finland was free to frame its own commercial policy. The tariff of Finland protects the manufacturing industries, but allows the importation of raw or half-manufactured materials practically free. The tariff relations between Finland and Russia have always depended upon the vicissitudes of the Russian autocratic government. Under the liberal rule of Alexander I. the commercial relations between the two countries were regulated upon the principle of reciprocity. Under the reactionary rule of Nicholas I. Russian manufactures were allowed to be imported free into Finland, whereas goods imported from Finland to Russia were treated alike with other foreign imports. Under the liberal rule of Alexander II. reciprocity was restored. But the Russianizing policy, which was inaugurated by Alexander III. and culminated in the overthrow of constitutional government under Nicholas II., has reverted to the principles of Nicholas I.

The present rule is that all Russian merchandise can be introduced free into Finland, with the exception of sugar, tobacco, wines, liqueurs, and margarine, which pay much smaller duties when coming into Finland from Russia than the same articles from other countries. On the other hand, Finland is only allowed to export to Russia certain products of agriculture and other industries of the same character. . . . With a few exceptions, manufactured articles pay the same duty as those imported from other countries. (Pp. 171, 172.)

A tariff union with Russia, under the present high-tariff policy of the empire would, far from remedying the evils of the present situation, be destructive of the trade and industry of Finland. In Finland all industries necessitate commerce with foreign countries, and free import from Russia could not replace this, inasmuch as many things would be unobtainable from Russia. The Russian tariff extended to the Finnish ports

would increase the price of all present imports — coal, iron, and other metals, machines, and the most common necessities of life, such as sugar, coffee, and salt. By destroying the import trade it would also hinder export, first by rendering production more costly ; then by diminishing the already small freights which ships can take home to the country. . . . It is calculated that a simple fisher family consisting of four persons, which is rather below the general number, would have to pay eighty-five marks more per annum, fifty-five marks fifty penni as increased duty on the salt needed for forty barrels of Baltic herring prepared for sale, and thirty marks for such simple necessities as coffee, chickory, iron, etc. -A Finnish cottier who keeps four cows and a horse would have to pay fifty marks extra for iron, nails, woolens, coffee, chickory, etc. A common peasant proprietor with forty cows and five horses would have to pay fifty-four marks extra for iron and nails, and seven marks twenty penni for artificial manure, or a total of 240 marks more. (Pp. 173, 174.)

Such facts and figures tell why all classes of the Finnish people are as one in their opposition to the Russianizing policy of the imperial government. Other causes of a national and political nature, which add to the embitterment against the unconstitutional conduct of the Russian administration in Finland, are ably and forcefully dealt with by the author in his concluding chapter ; they are, however, beyond the scope of this review.

I. A. HOURWICH.

THE COLUMBIAN UNIVERSITY.